UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,527	12/18/2000	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920000920US1	8506

7590 09/24/2004

Hulsey, Grether, Fortkort & Webster
8911 Capital of Texas Highway
Suite 3200
Austin, TX 78759

EXAMINER	
KIANERSI, MITRA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/740,527	DUTTA, RABINDRANATH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	mitra kianersi	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 December 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on June/28/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant on page 2, line 17, argues that there is nothing in Shi that either teaches or suggests that Shi's cookie is unmodifiable." Shi does not anticipate the presently claimed invention because he does not teach the elements of transmitting an unmodifiable cookie" or storing the unmodifiable cookie." In fact as mentioned above, Shi replaces a first cookie with a second cookie, an action that is most certainly a modification. In order to describe the unmodifiable nature of Applicant's cookie, Applicant's specification includes several examples of techniques that can be employed to guarantee this aspect of the claims. For example, one technique involves using an encryption code know only to the web browser 32. Another disclosed technique employs public and private cookie files [36]. In short, unlike the current application, Shi neither teaches nor suggests an unmodifiable cookie containing state information. Shi et al. On col 7, lines 26-34 discloses that the distributed computing environment includes a security service for returning a credential to a user authenticated to access the distributed file system. In response to receipt by the Web server of a user id and password from the Web client, a login protocol is executed with the security service. If the user can be authenticated, a credential is stored in an in-memory credential database of credentials associated with authenticated users. The Web server then returns to the Web client a persistent client state object having a unique identifier therein. This object, sometimes referred to as a cookie, is then used to enable the Web client to browse Web documents in the distributed file system. In particular, when the Web client desires to make a subsequent request to the distributed file system, the persistent client state object including the identifier is used in lieu of the user's id and password, which makes the session much more secure. In this operation, the cookie identifier is used as a pointer into the in-memory credential database, and the credential is then retrieved and used to facilitate multiple file accesses from the distributed file system.

Regarding claims 3 and 9, applicant on page 2, line 28, argues that Shi does not teach or suggest storing a single cookie in two different files, a public file and a private file. Rather, Shi is directed to the storage of a multiple files, some of which are protected by Web server security and some protected by DFS security. For example, Shi refers to the both the documents stored on the server local directory (protected by Web server security) and DFS (protected by DFS security. In other words, Shi is describing multiple documents rather than a single document. Further, Shi describes the problem of a user being prompted for a user id and a password every time there is a switch from DFS document to web server document, and vice versa. Clearly, Shi is talking about at least two different documents. Shi on col 8, lines 58-61, teach that at step 78, the DFS credential generated by the login (to the DCE Security Server) is stored in a database (preferably an in-memory storage) associated with the session manager and indexed by the unique id. Col 9, lines 8-15 subsequent requests from the browser carry the cookie with the unique id and thus steps 84, 86 and 88 are repeated for all subsequent requests. Thus, according to the invention, it is only required to pass user id and password a single time, namely, when the user initially logs into DFS. Thereafter, a cookie with a unique id is passed on subsequent requests.

Applicant on page 3, line 7, argues that with respect to claims 4 and 10, the Office Action mischaracterizes performing a path check as checking the public cookie file for a matching unmodifiable cookie. As mentioned above, Shi does not maintain two copies of a single file. Further, performing a path check typically involves an attempt to access a particular file rather than any attempt to match files. Shi on col 7, lines 26-34, when searching the cookie list for a valid cookie, a comparison of the domain attributes of the cookie is made with the Internet domain name of the host from which the URL will be fetched. If there is a tail match, then the cookie will go through path matching to see if it should be sent. "Tail matching" means that domain attribute is matched against the tail of the fully qualified domain name of the host.

Applicant on page 3, line14, argues that with respect to claims 6 and 12, Wagner is directed at refreshing a public cookie by sending HTML files from a server to update an area within a previously transmitted page or, in other words, updating the cookie because

an area within the previously transmitted page has been modified. This cannot be characterized as updating the public cookie tile to reflect the unmodifiable cookies found in the private cookie file. Obviously, Wagner is only updating the public cookie, when that which he is copying has been modified. Wagner on col 3, lines 42-52) disclose that to address the need to detect interpretive language programs and cookie commands data segments of data streams, some known browsers have been modified to include a function which a user may activate to prevent the execution of interpretive language programs and cookie commands. Typically, the browser is modified so the portion of the browser program that passes an interpretive language program or cookie command to an interpreter for execution, checks a switch which may be set by a user, to determine whether passing programs and commands to the interpreter is enabled.
Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the references because While these modified browsers disable the execution of interpretive programs and cookie commands, they do not notify a user that an interpretive program or cookie command was detected. Thus, users are unaware of those server sites that attempt to send interpretive programs and cookie commands to the user's browser and, as a result, the user may deactivate the interpretive program and cookie command disabling function of the browser. Thereafter, the user may request an HTML file from a server previously visited and receive an interpretive program or cookie command that now executes on the user's computer. If the user had known the server site was sending interpretive programs or cookie commands, the user may have chosen not to request files from the server. What is needed is a program which detects programs or cookie commands embedded within a data stream received from another computer and which notifies the user of the interpretative language program or cookie command so the user may be aware that the server is sending interpretive programs or cookie commands. What is needed is a program, which notifies the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program. What is needed is a way to restrict access to resources or data on a computer when the computer is in communication with another computer. (col 3, lines 52-67) and (col 3, lines 1-10).

Regarding dependent claims, because the arguments with respect to the allowableness of independent claims were found unpersuasive, theses same arguments are not persuasive with respect to the other independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 7-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shi et al. (US Patent No. 5,875,296)

1. As per claim 1, 7, 8, 13 and 14, a method of maintaining state information on a client, the method comprising: transmitting an unmodifiable cookie, which specifies state information from a server to the client; and storing the unmodifiable cookie on the client. (corresponds to when the Web server sends the Web client a login HTML form and a first cookie including a URL identified by the HTTP request. Col 3, lines 22-46)
2. As per claims 2 and 15, the method wherein the unmodifiable cookie is transmitted from the client to the server when the client makes predefined requests to the server and wherein the unmodifiable cookie is transmitted with the file. (the Web client transmits the completed form along with the first cookie (including the URL entry) back to the Web server. Col 3, lines 22-46)
3. As per claims 3 and 9, the method wherein a copy of the unmodifiable cookie is stored in a public cookie file and the unmodifiable cookie is stored in a private cookie file in a location separate from the public cookie file on the client. (If a mechanism is provided

for having the Web server access the distributed file system, the Web server will maintain both the documents stored on the server local directory (protected by Web server security) and DFS (protected by DFS security). col 2, lines 1-18)

4. As per claims 4 and 10, the method further comprising in response to a request from the client for a document requiring an unmodifiable cookie, checking the public cookie file for a matching unmodifiable cookie. (At step 34, called path checks, the server performs various tests on the resulting path to ensure that the given client may retrieve the document. Col 2, lines 62-67)

5. As per claims 5 and 11, the method where no matching unmodifiable cookie is present in the public cookie file, checking the private cookie file for a matching unmodifiable cookie. (corresponds to when searching the cookie list for a valid cookie, a comparison of the domain attributes of the cookie is made with the Internet domain name of the host from which the URL will be fetched. If there is a tail match, then the cookie will go through path matching to see if it should be sent. Col 7, lines 26-36)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shi et al. (US Patent No. 5,875,296) and further in view of Wagner (US Patent No. 6,085,224)

6. As per claims 6 and 12, the method further comprising updating the public cookie file to reflect the unmodifiable cookies found in the private cookie file. Shi et al. do not explicitly

teach updating the public cookie, however Wagner disclose that file Refresh files are typically HTML files sent by a server to update an area within a previously transmitted page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Shi's distributed file system with cookies with method and system for responding to hidden data and programs in a DataStream thought by Wagner because While these modified browsers disable the execution of interpretive programs and cookie commands, they do not notify a user that an interpretive program or cookie command was detected. Thus, users are unaware of those server sites that attempt to send interpretive programs and cookie commands to the user's browser and, as a result, the user may deactivate the interpretive program and cookie command disabling function of the browser. Thereafter, the user may request an HTML file from a server previously visited and receive an interpretive program or cookie command that now executes on the user's computer. If the user had known the server site was sending interpretive programs or cookie commands, the user may have chosen not to request files from the server. What is needed is a program which detects programs or cookie commands embedded within a data stream received from another computer and which notifies the user of the interpretative language program or cookie command so the user may be aware that the server is sending interpretive programs or cookie commands. What is needed is a program, which notifies the user of detected interpretive programs and cookie commands without modifying the browser program. What is needed is a way to restrict access to resources or data on a computer when the computer is in communication with another computer.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mitra Kianersi whose telephone number is (703) 305-4650. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Mitra Kianersi
09/14/2004

ZARNI MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER